



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,371	12/09/2003	Hong-Hsi Lo	ORACL-01416US1	4427
80548	7590	07/29/2008		
Fliesler Meyer LLP 650 California Street 14th Floor San Francisco, CA 94108			EXAMINER WANG, HARRIS C	
			ART UNIT 2139	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/29/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/731,371	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> HARRIS C. WANG	<b>Art Unit</b> 2139	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 January 1949.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/11/2008 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 4/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant has argued that "Fisher discloses a common authentication protocol or proxy which includes an authentication interface that communicates with directory service authentication backends. Specially, in Paragraph [0023], Fisher emphasizes that the CAP server obtains the user or user group from an external source....Since Fisher emphasizes that the CAP server obtains the user or user group information from an external source, it teaches away from managing security database from a central point (Remarks pg. 10)"

Fisher in the cited section teaches managing a security database from a central point, the authentication backend, or in other words the second server. The fact that the

authentication backend is external to the CAP server is consistent with the Examiner's rejection.

The Applicant has next argued that "it would not be obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to model or use Fisher to hold user or user group information on the Cap server (or the first type server) while maintaining other user security information in a data repository (Remarks pg. 10)."

The Examiner considers this argument spurious, as the Examiner has never issued such an obvious statement. Nonetheless, this argument is unpersuasive because as cited above by the Applicant himself, the CAP server does not store the group information. Rather the authentication backends, or the second server stores the group information. Evidence can be found in Paragraphs [0131-0132] of Fisher (*"Retreival of User Information. The APIs typically retrieve a list of all the single string representations of user lds (or user group lds) form the authentication backend."*).

The Applicant's amendment of a "plurality of first type servers." As the purpose of Fisher is to connect a plurality of different application servers to a single authentication backend, Fisher anticipates "a plurality of first type servers. (See abstract or Figure 1)"

The Applicant has amended to include a "second type" server. The Examiner considers the authentication backend the second server, which is different than the first type server.

The Applicant has amended to indicate that a default security plugin at "each of said plurality of first type servers." As the CAP is capable of interfacing with multiple different applications via a security plugin, each application is capable of interaction with

the CAP. (*"The invention addresses the need to reduce user logon complexity at the desktop while offering the open architecture to integrate easily into current enterprise environments...CAP...allows applications to access existing directory service authentication backends"* Paragraphs [0006-0007])

The Applicant has amended that each of the plurality of first type servers is an application server and the second type is an enterprise server. Fisher teaches wherein the first server is an application server (See Figure 1, Application **20** and CAP **40**.) Fisher teaches wherein said second server is an enterprise server (*"This architecture supports and takes advantage of existing enterprise user/group authentication backends 110"* Paragraph [0126]).

Therefore the Examiner finds the Applicants arguments unpersuasive.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In independent claims 1, 13, 26, 38, the claims describe "a plurality of first type servers...that include an LDAP authentication server" and a "second type server that

includes an embedded LDAP server." Dependent claims 3-4, 16-18, 28-30, 40-42 indicate that the "first type server" is an Application (Web Logic) server, and the "second type server" is an enterprise (Tuxedo) server.

However Figure 1 shows the embedded LDAP server (2<sup>nd</sup> server according to claim 1) within a Application server (first according to claim 3), and an LDAP authentication server (1<sup>st</sup> according to claim 1) within an enterprise server (2<sup>nd</sup> according to claim 4). Therefore the dependent claims and the independent claims are contradictory according the specification.

Independent claims 1, 13, 26, 38 have been modified to "the plurality of first type servers holds group information and access control list. (emphasis added)" The Applicant has not provided any evidence to support this limitation.

Furthermore, Paragraph [0009] explicitly contradicts this amendment by stating "The present invention leverages the application server's security to help the system administrator managing their security database, by eliminating user and group information from the enterprise system. (emphasis added)" The first type server, at is the enterprise server according to Figure 1 and claim 1. The Applicant's specification which specifically teaches that the current invention "eliminat[es] group information from the enterprise system." Therefore the specification precludes the amendment that the first type server includes "group information."

Further evidence is provided by Paragraph [0040] of the Applicant's specification (*"For Tuxedo (Enterprise Server), group information is stored in the WLS groupofURLs class."*)

As the WLS is the WebLogic server, or "second type server" with the embedded LDAP server, once again this teaches that the "group information" is not in the first type server. For the purposes of examination, the Examiner will interpret the "group information" as being stored in the 2nd type server.

As claims 2-12, 14-25, 27-37, 39-49 are dependent on the above claims, they are rejected for the same rationale.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-2, 7-15, 20-27, 32-39, 44-49 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher (20030033535).

Regarding Claims 1, 13-14, 26, 38

Fisher teaches a system for single security administration comprising:

a plurality of first type servers, wherein each of the plurality of first type servers hold group information and access control list and includes an LDAP authentication server; (*"Fig. 2 shows a block diagram illustrating the architecture 200 of an exemplary common authentication protocol or proxy (CAP) server 40 according to one embodiment of the invention" Paragraph [0019]*). The Examiner interprets the CAP server as the first authentication server. The Examiner interprets the "first type server" as the CAP server in conjunction with the plurality of Applications that may call it

a second type server that includes an embedded LDAP server; (*"The architecture of the Cap server includes...an authentication interface which communicates with directory service backends including...LDAP" Paragraph [0019]*) The Examiner interprets the authentication backend the second server.

a single security data repository that resides in the second server and provides to the second server user security information associated with both the first server and the second server (*"the CAP server will perform authentication by accessing the database of the appropriate authentication backend for the given application...it obtains the user or user group information it requires to perform authentication function from an external user or user group database contained in an authentication backend" Paragraph [0023]*) The Examiner



interprets the data repository as the database. The Examiner interprets the user security information as the authentication or credential information.

a default security plugin at said first server that receives authentication requests from clients and forwards them to said first authentication server; (*"A user 30 wishes to begin an application 20 on the data processing system...The application 20 will send a request for authentication credentials 300 to the CAP server 40 (step 420) Paragraph [0021]"*) The Examiner interprets the application as the default security plugin that receives authentication requests from clients and forwards them to an authentication server. (*"Secure Channel from the Client...Security is provided by encapsulation at the transport layer so that alternate security methods may be used or "plugged in." Paragraph [0123]"*) (*"The invention addresses the need to reduce user logon complexity at the desktop while offering the open architecture to integrate easily into current enterprise environments...CAP...allows applications to access existing directory service authentication backends" Paragraphs [0006-0007]"*)

wherein, in response to receiving a request for authentication from a client, the system initiates a session between said first server and said second server, passes query information from said LDAP authentication server to said embedded LDAP server, receives corresponding user information, (*"The CAP server will perform authentication by accessing the database of the appropriate authentication backend 110 for the given application." Paragraph [0023]"*)

and creates a token that reflects an authentication result that can be used by said client. (*"If the credentials are authentic, then the CAP server will return an authentication token to the application." Paragraph [0024]"*)

The Applicant's amendment of a "plurality of first type servers." As the purpose of Fisher is to connect a plurality of different application servers to a single authentication backend, Fisher anticipates "a plurality of first type servers. (See abstract or Figure 1)"

Fisher teaches wherein the first type server in combination with the CAP (Common Authentication Proxy) server connects with a LDAP authentication backend. (See Figure 1, CAP, LDAP, also "The invention supports many different backend authentication directory services including...LDAP (Paragraph [0008])") Therefore the CAP server (first type) acts as an LDAP authentication server.

Fisher does not explicitly teach the first type servers holding group information and an access control list.

Applicant's own admitted prior art "Overview of the CORBA security features" teaches ("A Weblogic Server security realm and a BEA Tuxedo domain are considered separate scopes of security definitions. Each contains its own database of users and access control" pg. 5)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the first type servers hold group information and access control.

The motivation is that Fisher suggests that the invention integrates easily "without changing existing authentication and access control infrastructures." The motivation is to ease integration.

The cited art teaches the method that the system performs.

Regarding Claims 2, 15, 27, 39

Fisher teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the system checks a user profile database or user profile configuration information to determine where the user security information is stored. *(“In general, the CAP server...obtains the user or user group information it requires to perform its authentication function from an external user or user group database contained in the authentication backend” Paragraph [0023])*

Regarding Claims 3-4, 16-17, 28-29, 40-41

Fisher teaches the system of claim 1. Fisher teaches wherein the first server is an application server (See Figure 1, Application **20** and CAP **40**.) Fisher teaches wherein said second server is an enterprise server *(“This architecture supports and takes advantage of existing enterprise user/group authentication backends 110” Paragraph [0126]).*

Regarding Claim 7, 20, 32, 44

Fisher teaches the system of claim 1 wherein said query information is query user information that specifies a particular user or group of users. *(“In general, the CAP*

*server...obtains the user or user group information it requires to perform its authentication function from an external user or user group database contained in the authentication backend” Paragraph [0023])(LDAP User Filter, LDAP Group Filter, Paragraph [0095-6])*

Regarding Claim 8, 21, 33, 45

Fisher teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the system includes a plurality of servers (*“The invention seeks to provide a method and system for user authentication in a data processing system wherein users only have to logon once, while being able to access multiple applications and servers” Paragraph [0006])*

Regarding Claim 9, 22, 34, 46

Fisher teaches the system of claim 8 wherein at least one of said plurality of servers include an LDAP authentication server. (*“LDAP Server Host” Paragraph [00941])*

Fisher does not explicitly teach where at least two servers include an LDAP authentication server.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include two LDAP authentication servers.

The motivation is that Fisher already teaches using multiple servers, including one LDAP server. The mere duplication of parts does not produce any unexpected results. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to add another LDAP server without altering the functionality of the system.

Regarding Claim 10, 23, 35, 47

Fisher teaches the system of claim 1, further comprising a user information cache that caches a copy of said user information. (*“the authentication token is generally stored in cache memory within the data processing system and is passed to each application that the user needs to access without the need to request new credentials each time”* Paragraph [0030]) The Examiner interprets the authentication token as comprising use credentials.

Regarding Claim 11, 24, 36, 48

Fisher teaches the system of claim 1. The Examiner asserts that any system which has multiple servers and is compatible with LDAP (including the system of Fisher) is scalable to include multiple LDAP authentication servers and/or multiple embedded LDAP servers.

Regarding Claim 12, 25, 37, 49

Fisher teaches the system of claim 1 wherein at least one of said servers include a console program for administering the security of the system. (*“The CAP server includes an administration system that provides a system administrator with the ability to change or configure the CAP server’s properties. Configuration may be HTML based. The HTML page*

*may be generated by a servlet. The administration screens may be accessible from a browser, and editor, or an enterprise information portal.” Paragraph [0084]) The Examiner asserts that an administration system as described inherently requires a computer program.*

3. Claims 5, 18, 30, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of TheServerSide.com article “BEA announces Bea Tuxedo 8.0 and Bea Weblogic Enterprise 6.0” on June 12, 2001.

Regarding Claims 5, 18, 30, 42

Fisher teaches the system of claim 1. Fisher does not explicitly teach wherein said first server is a WebLogic server, and said second server is a Tuxedo server.

TheServerSide.com shows an article that teaches the Weblogic and Tuxedo servers are well known servers in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a Weblogic server as the first server and a Tuxedo server as the second server.

The motivation is that WebLogic and Tuxedo servers are well known in the art, and one of ordinary skill would have been able to use these servers in the system of Fisher.

Art Unit: 2139

4. Claims 6, 19, 31 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of Zois.co.uk's Technical note "Using Tuxedo Asynchronously with Global Transaction" published 4/23/2001.

Regarding Claim 6, 19, 31, 43

Fisher teaches the system of claim 1, but Fisher does not explicitly teach wherein wherein said client is a Tuxedo client and said request is a tpinit call.

Zois.co.uk teaches that Tuxedo clients and tpinit calls are common in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Tuxedo clients as a client and tpinit calls for the request.

Tuxedo clients and tpinit calls for requests were common at the time of the invention and one of ordinary skill in the art could use these well known items in the system of Fisher with predictable results. The motivation is to enable the use of calling.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HARRIS C. WANG whose telephone number is (571)270-1462. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KRISTINE KINCAID can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2139

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HCW

/Kristine Kincaid/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2139